persons of standing in the public services. In Singapore, however, for more than 25 years every judicial officer holding office in the subordinate courts has been a 'qualified person' under the Legal Profession Act.

Therefore, paragraph (b) has lost much of its practical importance. Judicial officers of courts subordinate to the High Court have gained vast experience in respect of cases similar to, if not more complicated than, those with which the [applicants] had been concerned. District Judges are qualified persons of several years' standing....."

In the light of the decisions I have referred to, for the provisions of section 184(1) (b) to be successfully invoked today the case must be an extraordinarily rare one and I find it extremely difficult to think of one. For the historical reasons I have stated, and, given the qualifications and experience of district judges and the more senior magistrates, I am of the firm view that for all practical purposes and intent, paragraph (b) of section 184(1) has fallen into desuetude and obsolescence for transfer of cases to the High Court. Having regard to Singapore's size and comparing Singapore to the geographically separate and dispersed territories that once constituted the Straits Settlements, the same may well be true for all cases, whether for transfer to the High Court or from one subordinate court to another, of paragraphs (c) and (d) of section 184(1).

Application dismissed.

Solicitors: *Amarjit Rubin & Partners.*

MALAYSIAN REPORTS

RASHID BIN MOHAMED v. THE CHARTERED BANK

[S.C. (Salleh Abas L.P., Syed Agil Barakbah & Wan Hamzah S.C. JJ.) May 15, 1986]

[Kuala Lumpur – Supreme Court Civil Appeal No. 1 of 1986]

Debtor and Creditor – Debt – Assignment – Notice – Civil Law Act, 1956, s. 4(3).

Banking – Debtor and creditor – Assignment of debt to bank – Demand for payment.

This was an appeal from the decision of Gunn Chit Tuan J. in [1986] 2 M.L.J. 219, *sub nomine, Chartered Bank* v. *Rashid bin Mohamed.* The Supreme Court allowed the appeal and ordered the civil suit be remitted back to the High Court. There was no written judgment. We reproduce below the Order of the Supreme Court.

SUPREME COURT.

James Leslie Ponniah for the appellant.
T. Thomas for the respondent.

ORDER

THIS APPEAL coming up this 15th day of May 1986 for hearing in the presence of Mr Thomas Thomas of Counsel for the Respondent and Mr James Ponniah of Counsel for the Appellant *AND UPON READING* the Record of Appeal *AND UPON HEARING* Counsel as aforesaid *IT IS ORDERED* that this Appeal be and is hereby allowed with costs, *AND IT IS FURTHER ORDERED* that the Civil Suit be remitted back to High Court for trial.

GIVEN under my hand and the Seal of the Court this 15th day of May 1986.

Sd.
The Senior Assistant Registrar,
Supreme Court Malaysia,
KUALA LUMPUR.

Solicitors: *Stanley Ponniah, Ng & Soo; Skrine & Co.*